

## **I. Project Title: Institutionalizing Social Science Data Collection**

Award Number: NMFS Grant No. 01-NER-034 (2001)

Submitted to: NOAA Fisheries

Date: May 24, 2006

Prepared by: Madeleine Hall-Arber, Ph.D., MIT Sea Grant College Program

Principal Investigators:

David Bergeron

Massachusetts Fishermen's Partnership

2 Blackburn Center

Gloucester, MA 01930

[dbergeron@mass-fish.org](mailto:dbergeron@mass-fish.org)

Madeleine Hall-Arber, PhD

Center for Marine Social Sciences

MIT Sea Grant College Program

3 Cambridge Center, NE20-368

Cambridge, MA 02142

[arber@mit.edu](mailto:arber@mit.edu)

Bonnie J. McCay, PhD

Rutgers Board of Governors Distinguished

Service Professor

Chair, Department of Human Ecology

Cook College, Rutgers the State University

55 Dudley Road

New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901

[mccay@aesop.rutgers.edu](mailto:mccay@aesop.rutgers.edu)

Websites: <http://www.mass-fish.org/communit.htm> and

<http://web.mit.edu/seagrant/aqua/cmss/comm%20mtgs/commmtgs.html>

## **II. Abstract**

This project explored the potential for community-based data collection and analysis to help address the scarcity of social science data on the fishing industry and fishing communities. Community panels were established for Portland, ME, New Bedford, Massachusetts and Pt. Judith, Rhode Island. Each panel was comprised of 10 to 12 individuals, a cross section of harvesters, processors, shore-side businesses, and other members of the fishing communities. The groups identified issues of concern to their

ports, and with the help of coordinators and the PIs, gathered data through interviews and focus group meetings, then drafted and reviewed reports. A major goal of the project was to provide management agencies with information about the potential impacts of regulatory changes on fishing communities so that adverse impacts could be mitigated. Another goal was to establish a community-based, participatory, and on-going research platform in each of the communities. The panels can be and have been reconvened for special topics. The coordinators of the panels have been asked to report to town committees and boards to present summaries of the results. These opportunities have led to decisions benefiting the fishing industry.

### **III. Executive Summary**

Community panels representing a cross-section of the commercial fishing industry in Portland, Maine, New Bedford, Massachusetts and Pt. Judith, Rhode Island used a variety of research methods to identify and analyze critical issues in their industry and communities. Early in the process, Panel Project participants expressed an interest in going beyond the collection of demographic data that could be applied to fishing community profiles used in social impact assessments. Each of the panels identified and inventoried essential infrastructure components for the sustainability of their ports. In addition, each panel focused on other, slightly different, issues of significance to their communities.

All three ports noted the importance of considering the cumulative impacts of regulatory change. Furthermore, they discussed what they perceived as impediments of achieving or retaining a positive quality of life, both at the individual and community level. While economics was an important component, social factors pertaining to such issues as sustainability, equity, and social cohesion were also acknowledged as significant. Embedded in their concerns was an interest in a more holistic approach to all aspects of fisheries management, business and life style.

The Portland Panel emphasized the impacts of regulations that have reduced traditional flexibility in the industry and forced the processing sector to seek more consistent supplies of fish (often frozen), but also catalogued the strengths of and constraints on each of the major fisheries in the port. In particular, the development of the first display auction on the East Coast, the Portland Fish Exchange; the lobster fishery and the Northern shrimp fishery have all helped sustain the industry.

Both the Point Judith's and New Bedford's Panels inventoried their city's fishing industry infrastructure. However, both groups considered an analysis of the results of the yellowtail flounder Special Access Program (SAP) in 2004 essential to understanding the impacts of fisheries management.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Analysis of the yellowtail flounder Special Access Program (SAP) in 2004 is included with the New Bedford report found at Appendix 1.

The community panels began to develop their own “social capital” by creating networks among the participants that were based on a consensus of values, norms and trust. The panels also provided an avenue for building people’s capacities, especially by sharing information (education). This in turn facilitated the discussions that addressed topics that were regarded as critical to the subjective concerns, but also were relevant to realistic and effective management of fisheries.

The Community Panels proved to be effective and useful structures to collect and analyze social science information in response to grassroots driven needs and priorities. The project gained valuable experience in how such social science data collection and analysis can be institutionalized to inform fisheries and coastal zone management. Collaboration between social scientists, fishing industry participants and other community members was key to success of the Panels. Specific results of the project are discussed in the reports for each of the three community panels.

#### **IV. Purpose**

##### **A. Description of the problem addressed by the project**

A lack of fisheries social science data that has been consistently collected over an extended period of time presents a major obstacle to sound community planning. While individual projects have collected such data for specific places and points in time, there has been nothing comparable to the 30-year stream of biological data that National Marine Fisheries Service has been collecting via their fisheries assessment cruises and landings data.

Those responsible for planning in order to meet changing needs in fishing communities face the daunting challenge of doing so in the context of scarce and declining support for government functions. The proposal for this project suggested that establishing a community-based group for gathering and assessing data would be one way to meet that challenge. The hope was that it would be in the interest of the panel members to institutionalize the project with help from principal investigators.

When this project was proposed, NMFS was defending itself in more than 100 lawsuits, of which several were brought by fishing associations demanding that socio-economic data be considered when management plans were formulated, as required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Both NMFS and those in the fishing industry consider this information valuable. Although lacking a comparable legal mandate, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and the coastal states are also interested in identifying fisheries-dependent communities and the effects of management alternatives on them.

Moreover, many coastal communities are struggling with choices among multiple and conflicting demands on their limited coastlines and fishing grounds. The use of community-based panels to review, add to, and create new socio-economic profiles provides an important forum for people to decide what choices are appropriate given the

values, worldviews, economic situations, and social relationships of community residents. The information collected could also help communities protect their needs and interests in the fisheries management, coastal zone management, and economic development arenas.

## **B. Objectives**

Our primary objective was to develop a community-based process for gathering and assessing social science data relevant to the fishing industry. Equally important, our project intended to provide managers with information that would enable them to more accurately anticipate social impacts and mitigate those that are negative. These objectives are in keeping with the objective of the S-K Grant Program, that is, “to address the needs of fishing communities (as defined in the Magnuson-Stevens Act) in optimizing economic benefits within the context of rebuilding and maintaining sustainable fisheries, and in dealing with the impacts of conservation and management measures.”<sup>2</sup>

The project is based on the premise that the generation of accurate community profiles requires active participation of a broad group of stakeholders. We hypothesized that fishing industry participants, managers, scientists and members of fishing communities can contribute information through participatory research that is not readily accessible to a researcher from outside the community being studied.

## **V. Approach<sup>3</sup>**

### **A. Description of the work performed**

The three communities selected for this project, Portland, ME, New Bedford, MA and Pt. Judith, RI, were selected as representative of the variety of characteristics of the fishing industry in the region including inshore/offshore, large/small, urban/rural, fish/shellfish, mobile/fixed gear, auction/entrepreneur-dealer, etc. Moreover, they are significant ports in the region that complement the choice of representative ports for the first phase of this project funded by the Northeast Consortium.

Since one of our goals was to take a participatory approach, we started the project by forming an advisory committee based on recommendations from fishing organizations in the region. The panel was asked to identify the kinds of people who would be representative of the fisheries and communities involved in fisheries-dependent communities of New England and then asked to identify individuals who would fit these categories.

The Panels Project hired coordinators for each panel. We found it difficult to identify members of the fishing industry community who were able and willing to devote time to

---

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Dept of Commerce. The Saltonstall-Kennedy Grant Program: Fisheries Research and Development REPORT 2002 (August 1, 2002)

<sup>3</sup> A more detailed version entitled “Community Panels Project Methodology” can be found at <http://web.mit.edu/seagrant/aqua/cmss/comm%20mtgs/commmtgs.html>

scheduling and rescheduling meetings, discussing, debating, facilitating meetings and producing reports. The MFP office had to devote far more time than budgeted to seeking coordinators and helping schedule meetings. At least one of the PIs also spent more time than anticipated drafting and rewriting the reports. In both Portland and New Bedford, we hired coordinators who worked for awhile but were not able to complete the project, in part because of other opportunities that arose demanding their full-time attention.

When 10 to 12 individuals had agreed to participate as panel members in each community, an orientation/training workshop was held to introduce them to the existing data on their communities and industry. Most of the available information is incorporated in Hall-Arber, et al, *New England's Fishing Communities*.<sup>4</sup> The need for long-term data collection was discussed. The panels were offered the opportunity to identify what issues or data they considered most significant and worthy of recording. They were also asked which methods of data collection they would prefer.

The Panels Project relied on semi-structured key informant interviews as a major source of data. Initial drafts of the interview schedules were prepared by the principal investigators then revised based on comments of the coordinators and some participants. Interviewees are purposively selected through the “snowball method,” based on recommendations of key respondents, to be representative of boat owners, crew and shoreside business owners. Before interviews began, the researchers explained the project, goals, how data was to be used, how it would be stored, confidentiality, and noted that the respondent did not have to answer any questions they did not wish to, as per the federal government protocol set up for the Protection of Human Subjects.

The Panels Project used an ethnographic approach to interviewing. While protocols were developed to collect information that can be systematically analyzed, there was room for the introduction of additional questions and topics. The responses and/or conversation often extended beyond the specific questions included in the protocol. These “provide detailed personal accounts about unique experiences of particular people.”<sup>5</sup> Permission to record was also requested so that such details could be accurately recorded. Also used were participant-observation techniques and focus groups.

### **Panels' interest areas**

We found that we had to shift the focus to topics that were more current and compelling than the collection and analysis of what is considered background data for profiles of communities required by the fisheries management process. Those who are involved in the fishing community already attend an overabundance of meetings, so if they were to agree to spend time on the Panels Project, the results had to be viewed as likely to be

---

<sup>4</sup> *New England's Fishing Communities* by Madeleine Hall-Arber, Chris Dyer, John Poggie, James McNally and Renee Gagne. 2001. Cambridge, MA: MIT Sea Grant College Program.

<sup>5</sup> Morgan, p33

directly and immediately relevant to management decisions affecting the individual communities and their needs.

Each of the panels struggled for several meetings to identify an area of concern that they felt was worthy of their time and attention. All three panels independently recognized that their efforts were likely to have more impact on local and state level issues than on federal fisheries management.

Nevertheless, the reports that each of the panels have produced identify issues and information that will help the New England Fishery Management Council's staff fulfill requirements for analyzing the socio-economic impacts of regulatory change.

All the panels initially expressed concern that fishing industry infrastructure and the impacts of regulations on infrastructure had not been studied and were not understood by fisheries managers. Also all panels identified the lack of an historical perspective of regulatory impacts on communities. Cumulative impacts and change affecting the communities had never been analyzed, nor did the Magnuson-Stevens Act require such analysis. The three communities in the associated project (Gloucester, South Shore, MA and Jonesport-Beals Island, ME) addressed the question of their own infrastructure needs and constraints, how these have changed and been impacted over time as well as other threats to their sustainability as fishing ports. This topic resonated with the three panels formed for this project and each produced a report addressing this issue.

One of the intriguing results of this common focus was the difference in what was perceived as essential. However, what also became clear was the mutual reliance on other ports for such essential goods and/or services. While all three of the ports in this portion of the project could be considered "full-service hub ports," fishermen and support industry members often noted that they obtained services or goods in other ports as well.

Two of the three panels also focused on a specific controversy in groundfish management in the summer of 2004, that is, the Special Access Program for yellowtail flounder. The coordinator for the Point Judith panel interviewed participants and others in Pt. Judith and New Bedford for their comments on the SAP. One of the PIs conducted interviews, sought corroborating data and wrote up the case study.

### **Data**

Panel members and interviewees were promised that the information they gave to the project would not be revealed directly or in such a way that the participants' information could be attributed to individuals. Rather, we agreed to present the data as reports from each of the panels that were reviewed by panel members prior to release. These reports are available on line at <http://web.mit.edu/seagrant/aqua/cmss/comm%20mtgs/commmtgs.html>.

## Participants

### Interviewees, meeting attendees and panel members in Portland, ME<sup>6</sup>

Togue Brawn, Coordinator (2004)  
Stacey Wahlstrom, Assistant to Coordinator

Jennifer Brewer, Coordinator (2003)  
Gina LaDuc, Assistant to Coordinator

Caroline Skindler, Coordinator (2002)

#### *Fishermen: crew, owners, captains*

Adrian Martyn-Fisher

Bill Standford

Bill Train

Bruce Egan

Dan Ela

Eric Lush

Gary Odlin

Maggie Raymond

Proctor Wells

James Kuntz

Mike Love

Mike Stinchfield

Pedder Ashley

Raymond Haynes

anonymous Portland urchin diver\*

anonymous herring boat crew member\*

anonymous Casco Bay island former owner operator

anonymous midcoast lobsterfisherman, tunafisherman, shrimper, would-be groundfisherman\*\*

anonymous midcoast lobsterfisherman, former shrimper and urchin dragger

anonymous midcoast former owner operator

anonymous midcoast lobster owner operator, would be groundfisherman

anonymous midcoast former boat owner, former crew

anonymous Nova Scotia former owner operator

Thomas Kaczynski

Willis Spear

Zoth (Skipper) Rich

Jimmy Odlin

Marshall Alexander

Bob Murowski

Stephen Masters

Angelo Ciocca

Gabe Fula

Mike Stinchfield

Charlie and Gail Johnson

Vincent Balzano

George Manning

Kelo Pinkham

#### *Fishing family*

Gina LeDuc

---

<sup>6</sup> See Appendix 3 for complete report.

*Shoreside: Dealers, processors, support industries*

Hank Soule	Allyson Jordan
John Norton/Cozy Harbor	Daniel Libby
Marty Wendell/Sea Fresh	Ray Swenton
David Leeman	Jeffery Sawyer
Jennifer and Doug Holmes	Steve Bowman
Tris Thompson	Jim Propp

Anonymous processor  
 Anonymous boat mechanic/diver  
 anonymous midcoast boat owner, owner operator, former seafood buyer  
 anonymous midcoast boatbuilder, former lobsterman, former crew

*Government agencies and/or Task Force*

Sue Inches—DMR  
 Judy Harris – City of Portland  
 Cindy Smith – DMR state groundfish task force staff  
 Carl Wilson – DMR lobster biologist  
 Leila Percy – state legislator, state groundfish task force  
 John Williamson – NEFMC ME Council member  
 Ralph Boragine – NEFMC RI Council member  
 Robin Alden – State groundfish task force, former DMR commissioner, fishing family member  
 Ed Bradley – State groundfish task force, attorney  
 Anne Hayden – consultant  
 Scott Tilton—Fisheries Retraining Project

*Industry organizations*

Craig Pendleton – boat owner, former captain and former owner operator, NGO director  
 Bob Tetrault – boat owner, waterfront property owner, board member of financial institution, state groundfish task force

*Academics and other organizations*

Teresa Johnson – Rockland fishing family member, ecologist  
 Jim Wilson – U Maine economist  
 Les Kaufman – BU ecologist  
 Hugh Copperthwaite-CEI  
 Elizabeth Sheehan-CEI  
 Priscilla Brooks – ENGO economist

**Interviewees and panel members New Bedford Massachusetts<sup>7</sup>**

Dan Orchard, Coordinator  
 David Martins, Coordinator

---

<sup>7</sup> See Appendix 1 for complete report.

Rodney Avila  
 Frank Avilla  
 Reidar Bendiksen  
 Richard Canastra  
 Harriet Didriksen  
 Roy Enokson  
 Roy Fornia  
 Henri Francois  
 Ted Heidenreich  
 Pat Kavanugh  
 Jim Kendall  
 Marty Manley

Virginia Martins  
 Luis Martins  
 David Marujo  
 Bob Mitchell  
 Fred Osborn  
 Cindy Pettway  
 John Reardon  
 Joe Rogers  
 Billie Scofield  
 John Simpson  
 Loring Weeks

**Interviewees, meeting attendees and panel members, Pt. Judith, Rhode Island<sup>8</sup>**

Jackie Odell, Coordinator (2003)  
 John O’Leary, Assistant Coordinator, Coordinator (2003, 2004)  
 Karen Follett, Assistant Coordinator (2003)  
 Terry Boardman, Assistant Coordinator (2004)

Bill Cote  
 Bob Taber  
 David Beutel  
 Ken Thompson  
 Liz Rowell  
 Christopher Brown  
 Andrea Incollingo  
 Jay Gallup  
 Eric Reid  
 Ralph Boragine  
 Noah Clark  
 Al Conti  
 Michael Marchetti  
 Frank Ostrow  
 Jim McCauley  
 Troy Saulner  
 Steve Roebuck  
 Maury Loontjens  
 Donald Fox  
 David J. Deluse  
 Howard Follett  
 Tom Markarian of Markarian and Meehan (settlement house)

James Jordan  
 Tom Williams  
 Tim Champlin  
 Chad Maguire  
 Carl (Eddie) Thatcher  
 David Caprio  
 Bruce Knight  
 Jim Durkin  
 Scott Westcott  
 George W. Walsh III  
 Mark Kaser  
 Jack Fallon  
 Phil Rhule  
 Bill Long  
 Roberta Casey  
 Kenneth Ketchum  
 Ray Livernois  
 Donny Dobston  
 David Darnell  
 Scott Babcock  
 Don McGovern, RI DEM

---

<sup>8</sup> See Appendix 2 for complete report.

Also:

25 Economic surveys from fishermen

9 Economic surveys from shoreside businesses

## **VI. Findings**

### **A. Accomplishments and Findings**

The Community Panels proved to be effective and useful structures to collect and analyze social science information in response to grassroots driven needs and priorities. The project gained valuable experience in how such social science data collection and analysis can be institutionalized to inform fisheries and coastal zone management. Specific results of the project are discussed in the reports for each of the three community panels.

Many of the three panels' members expressed appreciation for the opportunity to express their views on a variety of related topics such as infrastructure, fisheries management, and community. However, the organizational difficulties (arranging meetings at a time and place that allowed the majority to attend, recording and/or transcribing notes on the panel meetings and interviews) and analyzing the results of the data collection were daunting tasks for individual panels. Where the coordinator was able to devote considerable time to the project (and/or related projects), the partnerships between fishing industry and social science worked well.

As the project progressed, the PIs held periodic workshops with the Panel Coordinators. Towards the end of this project, a day-long workshop with invitees from each of the six panels (for this and the associated project), the coordinators, managers, and the PIs was held to discuss the implications of this project, exploring whether this was a good way to generate social science data useful for fishery management and local planning and whether or not it would be feasible for the panels to continue.

## **Findings**

### **Institutionalizing Community Panels**

- The Community Panels project was effective as a mode of organizing community participation and collaboration in social science data collection.
- The industry organization role in the project was pivotal to coordinate, interpret, and focus research priorities and methods.
- The project indicated the importance of a multidisciplinary approach integrating:
  - Anthropology
  - Economics
  - Policy and planning
  - Industry and business
- A full-time industry-based project coordinator with policy or social science expertise is essential

- Full-time academic-based social science participation is essential and may be provided by a graduate student/PhD candidates
- Academic-based Principal Investigators are essential and may be part-time with sufficient graduate student/PhD candidate participation with strong PI supervision and guidance.
- Academic-based PIs should integrate multiple proficiencies into the project team.
- One or two strong local community-based panel members/local coordinators are essential for local outreach.
- Local panel members/coordinators require administrative and technical support from the industry-based organization and the academic PIs or graduate students/PhD candidates.
- Representatives of the communities must identify research questions and goals that interest them and that they are willing to help research.

Coordinators qualities are critical to success:

- Coordinators have to be familiar with social science methodology and familiar with the fishing industry. The associated Panels project benefited from one PhD candidate who was able to make the project her dissertation project. Thus we were able to obtain a level of social science expertise in the fieldwork that the project budget simply did not support. Nevertheless, fishing community members were able to function proficiently as coordinators when they had:
  - sufficient social science guidance and supervision,
  - they possessed good social and writing skills, and
  - they were able to devote enough time to the project.

We also sought coordinators known and liked in the communities. Importantly, the coordinators must be able to explain the goals and objectives of the project without imposing a personal agenda. They must be able and willing to summarize what is known and facilitate their panel's discussions. They must be flexible and willing to make an extraordinary number of phone calls to organize meetings and recruit participation. They must be able to help panel members set tasks and deadlines for accomplishment and they must be able to devote time to research and writing in order to further the work of the panels and the project. In addition, the coordinators need to communicate frequently with the PIs and other coordinators to share problems and solutions. This last point is critical to the identification of cross-panel interests, research questions and priorities.

Panels composition:

- Panels should be comprised of 8-12 core members and be open to additional members on a permanent or task basis
- Panel should be comprised of roughly half industry representatives and half people with broader community experience
- Panels should include a dealer, harvesters representing at least the range of vessel sizes, if not the range of gear types and species, someone with experience in local and

state government policies and agency structures, someone with a personal or professional interest in young people who want to fish for a living.

- Good panel members are often people who are already over-committed to civic activities. Respecting their scheduling and pacing needs is important.
- In some communities, adding core panel members on a permanent basis can be difficult after the second meeting or so, once group rapport and goals have been formed. This makes it important to obtain a good mix of skills and experience from the start.
- However, in larger communities, it is probably best not to think of the panel as a fixed object, but rather as a collection of individuals with various, interconnected expertise. We have found that for certain purposes, it is most effective to have sub-groups of the panel meet to develop data on a particular topic within their expertise. For other purposes, it is most effective to have the group meet as a whole and pool their expertise.
- In any case, panel members should not be asked to invest large amounts of time in topics for which other panel members have greater expertise

#### Panel coordination

- Depending on the number of hours the panel coordinator has available for data collection and administrative tasks, recruiting a core panel member with basic administrative, research or data entry skills as well as time to invest in panel support tasks can be successful with adequate oversight by a trained social scientist
- Distributing responsibility for panel coordination from the beginning helps to ensure that backup human resources are in place should the primary coordinator have to leave the project temporarily or permanently. This backup person could be a panel member, a PI, or a secondary coordinator.

#### Objectives, data and group dynamics

- Clarity and realism in communicating project objectives is crucial. Panel members are being asked to invest in a process with uncertain outcomes. This should be understood. It should also be clear how differences between the goals of the panel or the goals of the scientists will be negotiated.
- Although consensus may not always be possible, it is desirable for group cohesion and project momentum
- Participants need to believe that their input will be taken seriously and have a positive, practical impact

#### Social science

- The project must be designed to collect social and economic information. To panel members, it makes no sense to focus on social impacts without also, simultaneously, looking at economic impacts. The two are tied together and must be investigated together.
- Panels need regular access to quality advice on methodology and realistic goals from a social scientist and someone with regulatory experience. Such expertise might be offered by the coordinator, the PIs (in attendance or in close communication with the coordinator), or by a panel member familiar with these issues.

- It is critical that the PIs and the coordinators provide information about social science methodologies and instruments to panel members. Panel members do not want the task of reinventing social science; rather, they want to work with social scientists as active partners. In exchange for their participation, their views, and their hard work, they want information about effective social science methods. They want to be sure their work will be taken seriously and not dismissed as inadequate. At the same time, they raise good, hard methodological questions about existing social science methods, and their collaboration can be critical in the further design of effective methods.

#### Technicalities

- For future projects of this nature, digital recording of interviews and workshops should be encouraged. Concomitantly, funds for transcribing and notating should be an essential requisite of the budget.

### **B. Additional Work**

Need for further research was identified. Clarifications of questions concerning adequate access to moorings, parking, and docks would benefit from further research in some ports in Massachusetts and Maine. The need is not limited to a fine scale description and inventory of the fishing infrastructure in these ports. It is equally important to make all the information about local and state coastal management regulations available to both fishing industry participants and local and state officials. Such information must be synthesized and presented in a coherent manner so that industry and governmental agencies have access to the relevant facts, policies, constraints and opportunities. Improved communication among stakeholders, including fishing industry participants, community members, scientists and managers, is critically important.

Broad consensus was identified across all panels on the need for access to quality healthcare coverage for fishing families as a critical issue of enormous interest. The Fishing Partnership Health Plan (FPHP) continues to provide access to high quality healthcare coverage for more than 2000 members in the Massachusetts fishing industry. Efforts are under way at the congressional level to provide a mechanism to develop and implement healthcare access programs tailored to the needs of fishermen in other states based on the Massachusetts model.

Two other topics raised by the Community Panels have led to proposals for improvements in marketing and safety training. The latter has been recently funded.

### **C. Discussion: Scope of Social Science Research Relevant to Fisheries Management**

Early in the implementation of the Panel's Project, participants expressed an interest in going beyond the collection of the usual demographic data used in fishing community profiles. They were often interested in discussing what they perceived as

impediments to achieving or retaining a positive quality of life, both at the individual and societal (or more specifically, community) level.

What was striking about the discussions was the overlapping and interacting factors that constituted the impediments. While economics was an important component, social factors pertaining to such issues as sustainability, equity, social cohesion were often presented as more significant. Embedded in their concerns is an interest in a more holistic approach to all aspects of fisheries management, business, and life style.

Fisheries management is itself beginning to move towards a more holistic approach, specifically attempting to take an ecosystem approach to management. As a result of our work with community panels, we suggest that for an ecosystem approach to be successful, there must be a much more concerted effort to pay attention to social indicators that go beyond the focus on demographic data and other objective characteristics. The experience of the Panels' Project suggests that key to success may be growing "social capital" among stakeholders through institutional structures that facilitate how they interact and prioritize research.

The community panels began to develop their own "social capital" by creating networks among the participants that were based on a consensus of values and norms and trust. The panels also provided an avenue for building people's capacities, especially by sharing information (education). This in turn facilitated the discussions that addressed topics that were regarded as critical to the subjective concerns, but also were relevant to realistic and effective management of fisheries.

Broader, more complex or more interdisciplinary questions are likely to be successfully addressed in collaborative research. For example, the Panels Project, a collaborative project, found that concerns about retaining the infrastructure necessary for a viable fishing fleet was common to all 6 fishing ports, though the details differed. The infrastructure as defined by the panels included not only the produced or man-made capital of piers, facilities, etc., but also the social and human capital that provides the expertise needed for the industry.

As work begins on moving fisheries management towards an ecosystem approach, it could be tempting for natural scientists to focus on the predatory dimension of human impacts in the ecosystem while social scientists considered only the impacts of regulations on the human community. Neither of these areas of concern, however, would be a sufficient basis for successful ecosystem management. Data from the Community Panels Project clearly indicates a fundamental need for the analysis of social indicators associated with institutions and organizations so that the focus is not just on individuals, but on the society.

Persons and organizations committed to promoting and developing collaborative or cooperative research in fisheries would benefit enormously from further analysis of the characteristics and "meaning" of collaboration in research. That there are fishermen and scientists working together on projects does not mean that the full potential of that

collaboration is being realized. Deliberate analysis of the human ecology of collaborative fisheries research could be an important step towards understanding what is necessary for success in such research and an essential cornerstone for the institutionalization of participatory social science research in fisheries.

## **VI. Evaluation**

### **A. Attainment of goals and objectives**

Our primary objective, to develop a community-based process for gathering and assessing social science data relevant to the fishing industry, was achieved in all three communities. The associated objective, to provide managers with information that would enable them to more accurately anticipate social impacts and mitigate those that are negative, was also achieved. For instance, the October 15, 2003 interim report, *Comments on Amendment 13 by the Community Panels Project*, provided social and economic information to the NEFMC that the Council needed to evaluate the four alternatives presented at public hearings for Amendment 13 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan. These comments contributed to the acceptance of a fifth alternative that better addressed the needs of the industry and communities. The New England Fishery Management Council and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission are both interested in the Panel Project's reports.

The project has determined that the panel approach facilitates better communication and helps communities make better management and zoning decisions. Mutual ignorance between the industry participants and local and state government officials can lead to unnecessary friction and make effective communication difficult or even impossible.

### **B. Dissemination of Project Results**

Madeleine Hall-Arber (Each of the following presentations/publications presented data from or made reference to the Panels Project.)

- "Dragging out the Stories: Ethnography via Collaboration in New England's Fisheries" presented Society for Applied Anthropology, March 2006, Vancouver, BC
- Case Study 2: The Community Panels Project—Institutionalizing Social Science Data Collection presented to Managing Fisheries, Empowering Communities Conference, Anchorage, Alaska, April 2005 (For powerpoint presentation, see <http://www.uaf.edu/seagrant/Conferences/fish-com/agenda.html>)
- "More or Less a 'Fishing-Dependent Community' but Critical, Nevertheless," (Session: "Issues in Community Profiling: When Is a Community a Community?") SfAA, Santa Fe, NM, April 5-10, 2005
- Testimony on S2066 before the Subcommittee on Oceans, Fisheries and Coast Guard Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, U.S. Senate (June 19, 2004)

- “Acting Locally: Using the Oceans Wisely,” Fish Expo 2004, Providence, Rhode Island
- Panelist for The Institute for Community Research on "Crossroads: Critical Issues in Community-Based Research Partnerships," Hartford, CT.
- Comments on proposed Amendment 13, September 2003
- “Not Quite Grassroots Organizing, But Truly ‘Social’ Science,” presented at the Society for Applied Anthropology Annual Meeting in Portland, Oregon, April 2003.
- “On the Waterfront in New England’s Fishing Communities,” presented at the American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting in New Orleans, November 2002
- Panelist for Writers’ Workshop sponsored by NE Aquarium and the Knight Center, Boston University, November 24, 2002
- Grassroots Organizations: Community Panels Project. Fish Expo, Boston, September 2002
- Excerpts from “Fishing Industry Economic Needs Assessment,” presented to Governor Jane Swift’s Massachusetts Fisheries Task Force, August 2002

David Bergeron and Madeleine Hall-Arber.

- Panelists for “Protecting Community Interests” National Conference, *Managing our Nation’s Fisheries: Past, Present and Future*, sponsored by NOAA and the regional Fishery Management Councils, Washington, DC, November 2003.
- Community Panels Project—Evolving Cooperative Social Science, Presented at the Northeast Consortium’s Annual Meeting, October 2002.
- Community Panels Project: An Introduction for Discussion, Maine Fishermen’s Forum, March 2002.

David Bergeron

- MFP newsletter, *Waypoints*, Vol. 3, No. 2, April 2004
- *Waypoints*, Vol. 3, No. 1, April 2003
- *Waypoints*, Vol. 2, No. 2, September 2002
- *Waypoints*, Vol. 2, No. 1, November 2001
- Comments on Amendment 13 to the NEFMC Multispecies Fishery Management Plan, Gloucester, September 2003
- Comments on Amendment 13 to the NEFMC Multispecies Fishery Management Plan, New Bedford, September 2003

David Martins, Coordinator, New Bedford

- Comments on Amendment 13 to the NEFMC Multispecies Fishery Management Plan, September 2003

Jim Kendall, Panel Member, New Bedford

- Comments on Amendment 13 to the NEFMC Multispecies Fishery Management Plan, September 2003

Gina LeDuc, Assistant to Coordinator (Maine)

- Comments on Amendment 13 to the NEFMC Multispecies Fishery Management Plan, September 2003

### **From the associated project:**

Sarah Robinson, Coordinator, Gloucester Panel

- Panelist for The Institute for Community Research on "Crossroads: Critical Issues in Community-Based Research Partnerships. (Held in Hartford, CT).
- Article in *Commercial Fisheries News*, August 2005

Jay Michaud, Panel coordinator

- Panelist for The Institute for Community Research on "Crossroads: Critical Issues in Community-Based Research Partnerships. (Held in Hartford, CT).

Greg Ketchen, Panel member

With Jack Wiggin, the consultant from Urban Harbors Institute at University of Massachusetts, Boston who is drafting the recommendations for the Harbor Committee, were on local broadcasting TV June 1, 2005 to talk about what the draft recommendations are for Gloucester Harbor. They mentioned the panels project several times.

### **Published Reports**

- The Community Panels' reports are on the web at <http://web.mit.edu/seagrant/aqua/cmss/comm%20mtgs/commmtgs.html>
- "Fishing Industry Economic Needs Assessment," a memorandum presented to Massachusetts Fisheries Task Force, August 2002. (Prepared by Madeleine Hall-Arber, Ph.D., Sarah Robinson, J.D., S.J.D. and David Bergeron) is available at [http://www.mass-fish.org/MFP\\_Economic\\_Needs\\_Report.pdf](http://www.mass-fish.org/MFP_Economic_Needs_Report.pdf)

### **Table of Appendices**

**Appendix 1: New Bedford's Commercial Fishing Infrastructure Report, 2004**

**Appendix 2: Point Judith, Rhode Island Commercial Fishing Infrastructure Report, 2004**

**Appendix 3: Portland, Maine Commercial Fishing Infrastructure Report, 2004**